

Attorney Docket No. 13054-207A

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

In the first Office Action, the Examiner allowed claims 3-7, objected to claim 11, and rejected claims 1, 2 and 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected over Monsen in view of Walsh et al., and claims 8-10 stand rejected over Monsen in view of Abbott et al.

Claim 11 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Its base claim, independent claim 8, is hereby amended to include the limitations of claims 9 and 11 other than the RISC microcontroller of claim 11, and claim 8 as so amended is believed to be allowable for reasons similar to those stated by the Examiner as the reasons for allowing claim 3.

Claim 9 is accordingly cancelled, and claim 10 is correspondingly amended to depend from claim 8. Claim 10 is further amended to correct a typographical error.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 1. There is no apparent teaching in Walsh of a computer programmed to display video images from a video camera. To the contrary, Walsh appears to teach the production of videos, e.g., for education and training purposes, with the videos having data from an instrument superimposed on the video image. See, e.g., the abstract on page 48 and the top of the second column of page 49. Note also that the computer display screens of Figure 1 contain no video. It is respectfully submitted that the combination of references applied against claim 1 does not include all the limitations of claim 1 as amended. "To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." MPEP §2143.03. Therefore, for at least this reason, it is respectfully submitted that the cited combination of references does not support the rejection under §103.

Claim 2 is hereby amended to clarify the invention claimed therein as comprising a video converter having an input connected to the video camera and an output connected to the computer. See, e.g., FIG. 1 of the present application and the corresponding description. The Examiner acknowledges that Monsen does not disclose a video interface, and it is not apparent where on the cited pages 48-49 of Walsh, or elsewhere in the Walsh article, there is any teaching or suggestion of a video converter that receives an input from a video camera and converts it into a form suitable for display on a computer.

Attorney Docket No. 13054-207A

In view of the foregoing remarks and amending changes, claims 1-8, 10 and 11 now pending in the present application are believed to be in condition for immediate allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney if a discussion of any outstanding issues might help advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,



William F. Bahret, Reg. No. 31,087  
Bahret & Associates  
320 N. Meridian St., Suite 510  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204  
(317) 423-2300